

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: May 22, 2003

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chair, Architectural Review Commission
Joseph Coath, Vice Chair, Architectural Review Commission
Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission
Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission
John Patsey, Architectural Review Commission

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Planner
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

Call to Order

Chair Julian called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Roll Call

The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Shea Lubecke, absent; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, absent; John Patsey, present. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Mr. Julian indicated a change in the agenda. ARC 03-03 will be first.

Old Business

ARC 03-03 McGugan Residence – 121 West Lake Street (Public Hearing - Historic)

Petitioners: Lynn McGugan, owner; John Keating, architect.

Mr. Keating handed revised plans to ARC members and staff.

Mr. Julian asked how many options were given to the ARC. Mr. Julian suggested that the ARC number the options for reference

Mr. Sbiral said the options would be numbered by the page numbers.

It says in the packet that exhibits should be numbered.

Ms. McGugan indicated that the first option was the preferred option.

Mr. Julian said that the petitioner should point out the changes.

Mr. Keating said exhibit one showed the most significant changes (page 4) to the mass of the building. Mr. Keating indicated that the diagonal bay was being retained. A full railing was shown to lessen the impact of the covered porch. The addition was further differentiated.

Ms. McGugan indicated that the diagonal bay was gone on page 5.

Mr. Keating indicated that this is where the differentiation began on the east and west elevations. Mr. Keating said the petitioner was trying to keep the window proportion the same on the east elevation. Mr. Keating indicated that the 9 foot ceiling height and 7 foot plate height was maintained while creating further differentiation. Page 10 shows the some options for the west elevation. Mr. Keating went over the window option.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment.

Mr. Julian indicated that number 7 and number 13 were his preferences.

Mr. Petersen asked about window height in numbers 10 and 13. Mr. Petersen was concerned about the significant difference in height. The window in number 13 should be at the spring line. A double window option would be nice. The window should “pop out.” The space would make a nice area for a window seat. The window in 13 “feels” a little too big or too high.

Mr. Petersen was at a loss between number 4 (he likes) and number 5 (doesn’t like too plain). One last thing, Mr. Petersen likes the railing, but glass, French Doors, would be nicer than wood doors.

Mr. Julian said the doors should match the front.

Mr. Coath agreed with Mr. Julian; the doors should match the entry doors.

Mr. Petersen said that with the less formal railings the doors needed to be less formal.

Mr. Coath said the front was unique.

Mr. Julian said that the McGugans might want to see who was coming to the side door.

Mr Coath liked number 4 and he indicated that he liked the petitioner’s responses. Mr. Coath felt other options were not in the style of the existing home. The west elevation was best represented by number 10, but with an attic (like what’s on the existing gable).

Mr. Patsey thought numbers four and ten were the best options.

Mr. Julian wanted additional detail on materials.

Mr. Coath said the petitioner was matching existing materials.

Mr. Sbiral asked about the brand of windows.

Mr. Keating indicated that a Marvin wood window would be used.

Mr. Petersen asked if they would be the Integrity line.

Mr. Keating said no.

Mr. Sbiral asked about the existing porch windows. Mr. Sbiral wanted to know if these windows were being replaced.

Ms. McGugan indicated that they would be replaced with the same Marvin wood windows.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that the windows to be replaced are called out on page 10.

Ms. McGugan indicated that the windows were not original to the house. They were replaced in the 1950s or 1960s.

Mr. Sbiral indicated the original window should be restored instead of replaced.

Ms. McGugan said that she wanted to restore the window.

Mr. Sbiral went through the conditions and the points for the certificate.

MOTION: Mr. Patsey made a motion to accept ARC 03-03 as amended. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Roll call vote Chairperson Julian, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. Petersen, yes; Mr. Patsey, yes. Motion carries 4-0.

ARC 02-13 Stratton Residence – 406 South Cook Street (COA Clarification)

Petitioners: Leo Stratton, owner.

Mr. Sbiral showed Mr. Stratton's windows in a Power Point Presentation. Mr. Sbiral indicated that minutes and the COA were given to the ARC in their packet. The ARC inspection indicated that the conditions of the COA may not have been met.

The ARC had a general discussion about the conditions of the original COA and what the next course of action would be.

Mr. Julian indicated that the petitioner should go back to public hearing for changes to the plan. Mr. Julian also indicated that enforcement procedures should be followed after a discussion with the Village Attorney.

Mr. Julian deferred any further discussion to the June 12, 2003, meeting. A noticed public hearing should take place at this time.

ARC 03-05 Barrington Memorial Park – Corner of Lincoln and Hough (Public Hearing, Historic)

Petitioners: Beth Raseman, Trustee.

Mr. Julian disclosed that he serves on the BUMC committee. Mr. Julian also is the attorney for the landscaper, however, since the work is volunteer, Mr. Julian will hear the case and not participate in the discussion.

Ms. Raseman was sworn in by Mr. Julian.

Ms. Raseman said that the gateway arch will come back to the ARC. Ms. Raseman indicated revisions on the drawings relative to the statue placement and the memorial wall placement. Also, a third seat wall was added. Black granite will be used. Natural limestone with a distressed edge will be used on the seat wall. A bench will be added at the south entrance a similar trash can and bench will be added at the west end.

Ms. Raseman discussed the lighting plan relative to the placement of statue lighting. Lighting met the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Patsey asked about the archway. Mr. Patsey hoped to have something to discuss.

Ms. Raseman explained how the archway would be developed.

Mr. Patsey mentioned that a true arch should be used.

Ms. Raseman asked if the ARC would like to see a true arch or options.

Mr. Patsey said the ARC should see options.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC could approve the case, but the archway would be brought back to the ARC.

Ms. Plummer entered.

MOTION: Mr. Petersen made a motion to accept ARC 05-03. Mr. Patsey seconded the motion. Roll call vote Chairperson Julian, abstain; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. Petersen, yes; Mr. Patsey, yes; Ms. Plummer, abstain. Motion carries 3-0.

ARC 02-33 Stratford Company – 542 South Grove Avenue (Public Hearing, Historic)

Petitioners: David Thoma, architect.

Mr. Julian recused himself. Mr. Coath, as Vice Chair, chaired the hearing.

Mr. Thoma indicated the changes on the revised plans. Issues the windows and the FAR were resolved. Half round gutters were added.

Mr. Sbiral asked if the half-round gutters were indicated in the plans.

Mr. Thoma indicated that they were. They were shown on the front elevation and the porch elevation.

Mr. Thoma went over the column detail that Mr. Coath had requested. Mr. Thoma discussed changes to the garage doors, specifically, the changes made to the garage itself.

Mr. Thoma asked about aluminum clad windows.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that on an addition there was not a case that he could remember where addition windows were changed. Mr. Sbiral said that he thought the additions were allowed to have some more modern materials on them.

Mr. Coath said that the ARC would hope to see wood windows.

Mr. Coath asked for public comment.

Mr. Warren Hayes, 545 S. Cook.

Mr. Hayes said that the roof line should not be raised higher than the existing house. Mr. Hayes also indicated that the garage should be detached. Mr. Hayes felt that a floral design should be used on the front.

Mr. Thoma said that the two rooflines were never agreed to be aligned. There was a 14-inch difference between the two. Mr. Thoma indicated that there was no way to detach the garage because of the physical conditions of the land. Mr. Thoma felt that the mass was limited by doing this.

Mr. Patsey said that the accessory structure should be removed.

Mr. Thoma indicated that it would be removed.

Mr. Hayes thought that the garage was being moved to the north side of the property.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the garage was on the north side of the addition.

Ms. Plummer said Mr. Thoma should explain to Mr. Hayes where the garage was on the original plan.

Mr. Thoma explained where the original location of the garage was to Mr. Hayes.

Mr. John Hartz, 614 S Grove.

Mr. Hartz had a problem with the attached garage. Mr. Hartz felt that this garage was extremely inappropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Hartz felt that the Historic District would be harmed by allowing the garage to be attached.

Mr. Coath asked for the staff report.

Mr. Sbiral indicated changes to the staff report. Mr. Sbiral said the plans for the May 22, 2003, meeting were the final plans and the ARC should make their decision based on these plans only. Mr. Sbiral said that any questions regarding windows and the north side addition should be asked tonight. Mr. Sbiral indicated that he made a mistake regarding siding. Windows and siding were handled differently by the ordinance. Vinyl and aluminum are expressly prohibited for windows; however, cementitious siding had been approved and was not prohibited by the ordinance. Staff was in support of the petition, but it was up to the ARC to decide on the attached garage issue. The ARC had almost always approved detached garages.

Mr. Coath asked Mr. Sbiral about how the ARC would protect itself from setting precedents.

Mr. Sbiral said it was possible as long as the ARC noted specific unique facts like was done in a Zoning Variation, as long as a specific ordinance rule was not broken.

Ms. Plummer asked if the garage could be put in the back.

Mr. Thoma said the grade would be an issue in this case too. Mr. Thoma felt the massing would be awkward.

Mr. Patsey indicated that the windows were a major issue. Also, the garage should be detached.

Mr. Petersen indicated that the ARC could make a preliminary approval as long as the petitioner came back in for the windows.

Mr. Sbiral said it should be a very specific issue since this was a public hearing.

Ms. Plummer said the window sample provided would not be acceptable.

Mr. Coath said the window should be of historical proportion.

Mr. Thoma asked for specification.

Mr. Coath said that Marvin provides those specifications.

Mr. Thoma wanted the case to be approved with conditions on what to use.

Mr. Sbiral said this was possible if the ARC agreed with the placement and number of windows as long as the ARC was specific with what could be used.

Mr. Petersen indicated that the east elevation garage doors looked too tall.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the doors were 8 foot by 8 foot.

Mr. Petersen said there was not enough wall and that the plate was too tall. Mr. Petersen preferred the attached garage. Mr. Petersen had no comments on the nameless elevation. A gable should be added to the west elevation to break up the length.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the wall space was not available and that the ceilings were too low.

Mr. Petersen had no comments on the North side other than the garage looks too tall. Mr. Petersen felt a brick chimney would help break the mass. Mr. Petersen asked about approving the cementitious siding in the past.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC had approved cementitious materials in the past. Mr. Sbiral said original siding must be used.

Mr. Petersen would not approve the window that was shown.

Mr. Patsey said that the ARC had allowed cementitious material in the past on additions.

Mr. Coath hoped that existing siding could be preserved. Mr. Coath had troubles approving cementitious siding, especially when it was next to original siding. Mr. Coath suggested a purer style of enamel. Mr. Coath felt the petitioner should be more amenable to ARC conditions since they were allowing an attached garage.

Mr. Petersen indicated that there were lots of choices for different garage doors.

Mr. Coath indicated Buckridge was a nice choice. Mr. Coath felt a change in garage doors would definitely help the situation. Mr. Coath said that the cornice height on the garage was too high. Mr. Coath said that the North elevation should be modified to show a better ending for the building. Either a masonry chimney or some other feature would be nice since the neighbors would see this side.

Mr. Thoma felt the chimney was a good idea.

Mr. Coath thought a better looking cornice would be achieved if it were cut perpendicularly to the plane of the roof and then adding a half-round gutter.

Mr. Thoma felt that this might be a problem for maintaining the half-round gutters.

Mr. Coath said that this was the traditional installation and the surrounding houses had real cornices and this was a key element of old homes.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the original home did not have a cornice.

Mr. Coath said it had most likely been stripped off.

Ms. Plummer preferred the detached garage, but this site presented difficulties that prevented that. The windows presented should not be used. Ms. Plummer agreed with the other design issues. Wood siding should be used.

Mr. Sbiral went over the 15 conditions. Mr. Sbiral indicated that the petitioner was seeking an approval. Mr. Sbiral re-emphasized that the ARC should be clear on allowing the removal of historic material on the north side of the home. The north side addition was noted to be removed and reconstructed on the plans.

Mr. Thoma indicated that this was his understanding of how the north wing should be handled.

Ms. Plummer thought that the ARC had agreed to modify the plans and cut back the north wing.

Mr. Thoma said that this was not his understanding.

Mr. Sbiral said that Mr. Petersen was in favor of reconstructing the northerly wing.

Mr. Petersen said that reconstructing that wing was fine because cutting back and modifying it would ruin the intent anyway.

Mr. Thoma asked about the zoning issues.

Mr. Sbiral said that no zoning issues would arise if the addition were not modified or if the addition was setback seven feet from the side.

Mr. Sbiral went over conditions.

Mr. Petersen thought the porch on the north side needed another column.

Mr. Coath said this was a bad idea.

Mr. Sbiral said that changes were significant enough to warrant a return to public hearing.

All ARC members agreed.

Mr. Coath said that the ARC must go through another public hearing.

Mr. Thoma said that they had made too many concessions and now it was time to move on. Mr. Thoma felt that he could stipulate to all conditions except the siding and northwest corner.

Mr. Sbiral said that the petition was unique because of the pressure staff and the ARC had taken on some of the petitions. Mr. Sbiral said a negative recommendation would go to the BOT without ARC conditions or discussions.

Ms. Plummer said that there was a two-week delay for a building that the community would be living with.

Mr. Petersen asked if an approval could be made conditional on the details coming back.

Mr. Coath cannot approve this project with out seeing the changes.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC could commit to just looking at siding issues and northwest corner issues.

MOTION: Mr. Petersen made a motion to continue ARC 02-33 to June 12, 2003 at 7:30 pm. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Roll call vote Chairperson Julian, recused; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. Petersen, yes; Mr. Patsey, yes; Ms. Plummer, yes. Motion carries 4-0.

ARC 03-09 Barrington Park District – Beese Park Shelter Alteration 701 Cornell Avenue (Public Hearing, Non-Historic)

Petitioners: Barrington Park District, Mr. David Thoma, architect.

Mr. Julian returned.

Ms. Plummer recused herself.

Mr. Thoma presented the case to improve and expand the shelter at Beese Park. Mr. Thoma indicated the Park District wanted to improve the facility by enclosing the picnic shelter by providing toilets and a concession stand. Mr. Thoma indicated changes to the method of enclosure. Overhead doors would still be used, but their look had been changed significantly. Mr. Thoma showed a picture of how the doors would look (like French door with divided lights). Mr. Thoma indicated that they would look like “swing doors.”

Mr. Thoma indicated that brick would be added.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the egress doors would fold up when the overhead doors were open.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the doors would be cedar with contrasting stain to the other dark trim. Mr. Thoma indicated that a flat-top roof would be used to hide HVAC units.

Ms. Terry Jennings, Director of the Park District, explained that the Beese Park facility provided an excellent sports complex. Ms. Jennings stated that these changes would meet needs of sports teams. It would also eliminate porta-potties. The improvements would make the facility more useable. Ms. Jennings indicated that there was a budget and that the budget would need to be increased. Ms. Jennings indicated that the Park District was looking for a vote to move forward.

Mr. Sbiral gave the staff report. Mr. Sbiral indicated that the petition met the intent of the Appearance Code and that the petition should be approved.

Mr. Julian asked for public comment.

Mr. Coath expressed concern about the overhead doors and the feeling one might have with the interior space. Mr. Coath noted that moving to fancier garage doors lessened the impact of the doors on the structure. He noted that he would rather see real doors. He noted that the building is not a utilitarian structure like a garage, but instead a park shelter structure that is similar to an important building of a community.

Ms. Jennings noted that there are far less appropriate doors on many park shelters in the surrounding villages and other parks. She noted that there is vandalism in parks. Ms. Jennings indicated that the building was a shelter and somewhat of a unique situation. Ms. Jennings also indicated plans for adding a deck to the facility.

Mr. Petersen was still concerned about the garage-like space.

Mr. Julian pointed out that this was an interior space.

Mr. Petersen disagreed. He felt that the door leaves were too large. There should be four leaves in the doors. Mr. Petersen said that muttons may not be right.

Mr. Thoma said more leaves created a very busy look.

Mr. Petersen mentioned that transoms may work better.

Mr. Thoma indicated that space would be very small. He also indicated that the space was not a plush interior space.

Mr. Coath said the community would like a nicer park building. Mr. Coath felt the position of the park and the building needed to lend itself to being a landmark in the community.

Mr. Thoma felt that French doors were not a practical solution. He felt a soffit could be used to lessen the impact of the over head doors.

Ms. Jennings said that the Park Board and the community would be excited by this building. Ms. Jennings indicated that the Park did not want doors in the way. The Park District wanted to present a nice view of Beese Park.

Mr. Patsey felt that the building was appropriate for its use.

Mr. Coath felt that opening the base would open the space up like over head doors.

Mr. Petersen asked about the height of the doors.

Mr. Thoma said that the doors were 7 feet tall.

Mr. Julian said that the doors on the building had different divisions than what the picture showed.

Mr. Julian said he would approve the project as proposed, but he did not know whether that would affect the French door idea.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the doors would be open most of the time to maintain its shelter-like use.

Ms. Jennings said the doors would only be closed in bad weather situations.

Mr. Julian said hinges may be dangerous for little kids.

Mr. Petersen said garage door tracks may also be dangerous.

Ms. Jennings said that safety was being considered.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that this petition would go to the BOT either way.

Mr. Thoma clarified that there was only this new, revised set of plans.

Mr. Petersen felt that the divisions of glass were funny. The doors looked like simulated French door.

Mr. Thoma felt that the doors would look like a carriage doors.

Mr. Julian asked if the doors could have the vertical element removed.

Ms. Jennings indicated that she was seeking a vote either way.

Mr. Julian asked if this petition could be sent to staff after approval.

Mr. Sbiral said that this petition would go to the BOT and would either be approved, denied, or sent back to the ARC.

Ms. Jennings said that the ARC could trust the Park District.

Mr. Coath did not feel that this was a money issue.

MOTION: Mr. Coath made a motion to approve ARC 03-09. Mr. Patsey seconded the motion. Roll call vote Chairperson Julian, yes; Mr. Coath, yes; Mr. Petersen, yes; Mr. Patsey, yes. Motion carries 4-0.

Mr. Sbiral said that Mr. Thoma should give all drawings to him to give to the BOT.

New Business

ARC 03-10 Fifth Third Bank – 333 West Northwest Highway (Preliminary Meeting, Non-Historic)

Petitioners: Jeffrey Kutsche, architect

Mr. Petersen said the building looks fine. Mr. Petersen said a copper dome would be nice.

Mr. Kutsche indicated that the dome material was a simulated copper product.

Mr. Coath said that since the building had a classical reference, details should be considered to match the references.

The eaves should not be boxed out at the cornice return. The paired columns on the column returns should be dropped. There was no precedence for that.

Mr. Petersen said either bring the brick behind the gable up or push the roof back.

Mr. Coath said a classical cornice should be referenced. A crown should be placed on the rake detail. Mr. Coath suggested simulated divided light windows to spruce up the place. The eaves would be enhanced by going to a wood door system.

Mr. Coath said that the picture window on the “sunny side” elevation looked too large for the shutters. Windows should be spread apart with shutters. Shutters should be proportional to the window.

Mr. Coath said that the cupola looked too small.

Mr. Kutsche indicated that the proportions may not be totally accurate.

Mr. Coath would like to see cornice and eave details.

Mr. Petersen asked for brick samples.

Mr. Kutsche showed brick and shingle samples. The petitioner indicated that a shadow look would be used for the roof.

Mr. Petersen was wondering if the signage conformed.

Mr. Kutsche indicated that they thought the signage conformed.

Mr. Petersen asked about the trash enclosures.

Mr. Kutsche pointed the enclosures out on the site plan.

Mr. Julian asked about HVAC.

Mr. Kutsche indicated that the HVAC units were concealed.

Mr. Petersen did not like the brick. Mr. Petersen said that the brick at Deer Park Mall was better.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Julian said that the ARC would not do minutes at this meeting.

Mr. Sbiral asked that the ARC review minutes and return their comments to staff.

Planner's Report

Mr. Sbiral said that the house at 500 S. Cook was looking to replace some siding on the south side of the house. The sheathing is rotten. The owner wanted to replace the sheathing, but this will destroy the siding. Cedar siding will be used to replace the siding.

Mr. Sbiral said that the area was approximately 10 feet by 20 feet.

Mr. Coath did not think that that could be done.

Mr. Coath will take a look at it and return comments to Mr. Sbiral.

Mr. Julian re-opened discussion of ARC 02-13.

Mr. Sbiral indicated what the issues were.

Mr. Sbiral asked if Mr. Stratton would replace the windows with ones that complied.

Mr. Stratton indicated that this was not acceptable.

Mr. Sbiral said that the issue would be handled as a zoning violation.

Mr. Sbiral clarified what the Zoning Ordinance says.

Mr. Stratton said that he felt that he had complied with his COA. Mr. Stratton said that he had brought window samples to the Village.

Mr. Julian said that there was not a lot the ARC can do about the window issue.

Mr. Sbiral said that Mr. Jim Wallace did not remember giving approval for the window.

Mr. Stratton said that Mr. Wallace was not in on this meeting.

Mr. Julian said that this issue would not be resolved tonight.

Mr. Stratton asked the company if the muttons could be removed and the company said no.

Mr. Julian said that the revised plans could be reviewed by staff.

Mr. Sbiral asked Mr. Stratton asked what model of window would be used.

Mr. Stratton said that the same new windows would be used.

Mr. Coath said that Marvin or Pella wood would be required.

Mr. Sbiral said that all wood windows would be required.

Mr. Sbiral wanted Mr. Stratton to provide window samples to ARC for two new windows.

Mr. Julian indicated that the changes should be reviewed by the ARC.

Mr. Coath recommended Pella Architectural or Marvin Wood windows.

Mr. Coath indicated a casement window could be used for the kitchen window.

Mr. Sbiral said that the case must comeback.

Mr. Coath indicated that the window should line up with the upstairs window.

Mr. Julian said that this case will come back June 12, 2003.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ARC will need exact model numbers for the windows.

Mr. Coath was worried about siding.

Mr. Stratton said that there was siding.

Mr. Sbiral said revised plans were needed that showed the windows, the siding, etc.

Mr. Sbiral said that plans were needed next week.

Adjournment:

Mr. Petersen made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Coath seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all yes.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordination

John Julian III, Chair,
Architectural Review Commission